

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-9 and 11-24 remain pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 being the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 are sought to be amended. Claim 7 is sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,313,838 B1 (hereinafter referred to as “Deering”), in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2003/0233592 A1 (hereinafter referred to as “Lin”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,256,788 (hereinafter referred to as “Luu”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with respect to pending claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-24 for at least the following reason.

It is noted that although claim 7 is stated as being rejected on the Office Action Summary page, the Examiner did not reject claim 7 in the Detailed Action section. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 7. Claim 7 is

sought to be cancelled. The other independent claims 8, 14 and 21 have been amended to include similar subject matter of cancelled claim 7. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 have been amended to include a similar triple buffered graphics feature, as follows: wherein the first and second processors perform their respective tasks according to triple buffered graphics processing (claim 1); wherein the processor and the CPU perform their respective tasks according to triple buffered graphics processing (claim 8); wherein the CPU and the graphics controller perform their respective tasks according to triple buffered graphics processing (claim 14); and wherein the processor and the target processor perform their respective tasks according to triple buffered graphics processing (claim 21). Support for the Amendment can be found in original claim 7 and in the specification at least on page 11, paragraph 0026 through page 12, paragraph 0028.

The claimed triple buffered graphics feature allows the two processors even more flexibility in their performance of their respective tasks. This may further reduce the amount of time either processor spends being idle while waiting for a buffer portion to become available. (See, e.g., page 11, paragraph 0026).

Lin, Deering and Luu, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this claimed triple buffered graphics feature. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 and their respective dependent claims 2-5, 9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22-24 are distinguishable from Lin, Deering and Luu, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the Office Action's rejection

with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 28, 2008

/Molly A. McCall/ Reg. No. 46,126
Molly A. McCall
Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402